

## **REMARKS**

In response to the Office Action dated May 4, 2007, claims 1-26 are pending with claims 1-7, 14-17, and 19-23 being rejected and claims 8-13, 18, and 24-26 objected to. Claims 21 and 23 have been amended. Claim 22 has been cancelled. No claims have been added.

The examiner's acceptance of the drawings filed on August 27, 2003 is noted with appreciation.

Applicants note that the Information Disclosure Statements filed January 13, 2004, February 8, 2005, and September 15, 2005 **have not been acknowledged by the examiner**, and respectfully request the examiner to acknowledge these Information Disclosure Statements in the next Official Action.

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-7, 14, 17, and 19-23 are rejected on the grounds of nonstatutory double patenting over claims 1-4, 12-15, 19-23, and 31-37 of U.S. Patent No. 6,715,255.

In addition, claims 1-7 and 14-17 are rejected on the grounds of nonstatutory double patenting over claims 1-4, 17, and 18 of U.S. Patent No. 6,986,230.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, but in the interest of expediting prosecution have attached hereto a terminal disclaimer to overcome the objection.

On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1, 5, and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Harvey, Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 3,011,586). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. It is noted that the examiner has not indicated where in Harvey the "bridging member is fixedly connected to the side surface". The term fixedly is defined by the drawings and elsewhere as 'non rotating'. If the examiner would prefer such wording, for purposes of clarity (and without changing the scope of the claim), applicant is prepared to make that amendment.

Otherwise, the Harvey reference is fundamentally different in that every support member is rotatably connected to every other support member and the rotatability is on each of those members. In contrast, the present invention in claims 1 and 5 has a fixed connection between some of the supports and bridging members. This is more efficient, but also more complex and the hinging design must accommodate this in order to lay flat. The prior art, and specifically Harvey, does not disclose how to accomplish that and thus is

clearly not material for a §102 rejection. It is likewise incapable of supporting a §103 rejection as it gives no useful help in knowing how to redesign to the system according to the present invention and a person skilled in the art would require considerable experimentation to first, discover the problem and second, add the inventive knowledge to solve it.

Claim 21 has been amended to add the limitations of claim 22 to remove the Harvey reference. It is different from claim 1. Claim 22 has dependency altered accordingly.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the amendments and reasons provided above, it is believed that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. The amendments clarify the patentable invention without adding new subject matter. Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early allowance of all pending claims.

If a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any issues concerning this communication, please contact Applicants' attorney of record, Michael B. Lasky at (952) 253-4106.

Respectfully submitted,

Altera Law Group, LLC  
Customer No. 22865

Date: 5 November 2007

By: \_\_\_/Michael Lasky/\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael B. Lasky  
Reg. No. 29,555  
MBL/mar